Application No.: 10/521,011 Amendment dated April 2, 2009

Response to Office Action dated December 2, 2008

## **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Office Action of December 2, 2008. This Amendment is in full response thereto. Thus, Applicants respectfully request continued examination and allowance of the application.

Claims 12-22 are pending in this application.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowed claims 12-15.

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whitlock, et al. (USPN 4,806,171). Applicant respectfully traverses because Whitlock fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 16, including a T-piece having an upper end connected to an outlet of the variable flow expansion valve, a lower end connected to the injector, and a side connected to the device adapted to supply said valve with liquid carbon dioxide.

To the extent that Whitlock addresses the limitations of the T-piece, the Examiner points to nitrogen gas receiving port 40 and annular channel 42 defined by walls 44. Given the Examiner's position, in order to satisfy the recited T-piece elements, the port 40 would have to correspond to the T-piece side, and the open (right-hand in the Figure) and closed end (left-hand in the Figure) of channel 42 would have to correspond to the upper or lower ends of the T-piece. The Examiner has taken the position that the injection spout 18 corresponds to the recited injector and the needle valve 28 corresponds to the recited variable flow expansion valve. In such a configuration, it is evident that neither the open nor the closed end of the channel 42 is connected to an outlet of the needle valve 28. Thus, the device of Whitlock fails to disclose the recited arrangement of elements.

As such, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Attorney Docket No. Serie 5957

Application No.: 10/521,011

Amendment dated April 2, 2009

Response to Office Action dated December 2, 2008

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Whitlock, et al. (USPN 4,806,171). Applicant respectfully traverses because

Whitlock fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the limitations of the claims as

discussed above. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition

for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the examiner

believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, the

Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

A Petition for One Month Extension of Time has been contemporaneously

submitted with this Amendment. Otherwise, it is believed that no other fee is due at

this time. If that belief is incorrect, please debit deposit account number 01-1375.

Also, the Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment to deposit account

number 01-1375.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 2, 2009

/Christopher J. Cronin/

Christopher J. Cronin

Registration No. 46,513

Air Liquide

2700 Post Oak Blvd., 18th Floor

Houston, Texas 77056

Phone: 302-286-5525

Fax:

713-624-8950

7